

MARCH 1922

Lincoln & Nicolai Zimin p. 320.

CURRENT OPINION

Formerly CURRENT LITERATURE

Edited by Edward J. Wheeler & Dr. Frank Crane



**If the Senate Fails to Ratify
General Smuts Tells Why Wilson Failed**

35¢
A COPY

THE CURRENT LITERATURE PUBLISHING CO.
CURRENT OPINION BUILDING - NEW YORK CITY

\$4.00
A YEAR

troops from the Rhineland, supplementing his resolution by the statement that "Prussian militarism has given way to French militarism, which seeks to dominate Europe." The next day, January 4th, Congressman Reaves, of Nebraska, introduced a resolution that "the Government of the United States advise debtor nations, through the proper channels, that the payment of obligations now due to the United States will be acceptable," and declared that the program France has mapped out (maintenance of her army) "shall be paid for with her money and not with ours."

It may be recalled that the first treaty America ever signed was the Treaty of 1778 with France, pledging "mutual help and protection." George Washington's signature honors that important document, which has never been abrogated. George Washington did not dream that some day the sons of America would forget that France spent 775 million dollars to equip, transport and maintain the French army to which Corn-

wallis surrendered at Yorktown.

France is not discouraged. No individual, no party, will be strong enough to sow discord between the two Republics. But France is worried over that question of disarmament in view of new evidence tending to show that Germany has not disarmed, as the public at large generally believes. To mention but one fact: Very recently the officers of the Interallied Disarmament Commission discovered in Saxony 300 howitzer barrels, ready to be mounted, and at another place 150 more, making a total of 450 guns, sufficient to arm over 25 divisions. More discoveries of hidden guns, details of which need not be told here, have been made in other parts of Germany. Let us not forget to add that the population of France, including the territory of Alsace-Lorraine, numbers 38 millions, as against 70 millions composing the population of the German Republic!

Should France disarm? Would America disarm under similar circumstances?

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND NICOLAI LENINE—A CONTRAST

By Wayne C. Williams

IN the early part of the nineteenth century and with but a few years intervening two men were born whose lives are profoundly affecting the life of the world at the present time. These men were Abraham Lincoln and Karl Marx.

When Marx was born in Germany, May 5, 1818, Abraham Lincoln was a lad of nine years, running through the wilderness of Kentucky and Indiana, then a frontier in which Daniel Boone was pioneering and fighting Indians. Neither man ever saw the other. Lincoln doubtless never heard of Marx, tho the latter surely must

have heard of Lincoln. Lincoln was reared under conditions of free soil and the free institutions of a democracy whose key-note was equality. Marx was reared in an imperial autocracy. Both saw the later stages of the rise of the machine and the higher development of the factory system. Every man had a chance to rise in Lincoln's world, for the free soil and the flexible industrial conditions and the wide opportunities gave every man the hope of becoming a capitalist. In Marx's day, in Germany, a laborer could and did become a capitalist, but Marx acquired a peculiar and distorted view of the capitalis-

tic system and out of his experience and his theories, evolved from that experience, Marx wrote "The Communist Manifesto" and "Kapital," upon which modern Socialism is based and around which the doctrine of Bolshevism is organized and operating in Russia to-day. For Bolshevism is only Marxian Socialism with Russian trimmings.

Lincoln abolished a system of human slavery, both political and economic in its nature; he led a nation through civil war, reuniting the two warring sections of the country and preserving to posterity a republic that now spans this continent.

America and Russia are two of the most potent and influential nations in the world to-day, possibly the most potent. Their ideals and institutions are now animating the minds of all men and influencing governmental forms in nearly every country. The spirit and teachings of the democrat, Lincoln, and of the socialist, Marx, are opposite and hostile to each other, arrayed in deadly combat, in a contest for supremacy in many great nations of the world.

A wide gulf separates Democracy and Bolshevism. They are not only not the same thing but they cannot fuse. The world will not continue to exist half Democracy and half Bolshevik. The world did not continue to exist half Democracy and half Autocracy. The deadly enmity between these diverse principles brought the mighty collision of the world war and spelled the doom of Autocracy in government with its imperial dreams and its military trappings.

A new contest is before us, the contest of Lenine's class autocracy of industrialism against the liberal principles of our free institutions as exemplified in the principles, the faith and teachings of Abraham Lincoln.

Democracy stands for all men's having an equal chance to do what

they will with their time and talents. Lincoln expressed this when at Philadelphia, February 22, 1861, he said, "It was not the mere matter of separation of the colonies from the motherland, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country but hope to all the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, that all should have an equal chance."

The Russian Constitution, Article I, Chapter 2, Section g, provides, "for the purpose of securing the working class in the possession of the complete power, that the toilers shall be armed and the propertied class disarmed."

The purpose of Bolshevism is that there shall not be free opportunities for all, but for a particular class.

The Bolshevik government of Lenine is founded on the principle that the rich must be killed and eliminated from government and society, that the capitalist is a parasite and must be overthrown.

Marx, in "The Communist Manifesto," said, "the proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie." Lenine's "Declaration of the Rights of the Laboring and Exploited People" says, "in the interest of securing all the power for the laboring masses and the elimination of any possibility of the reestablishment of the power of the exploiters, the arming of the toilers and the complete disarmament of the wealthy class is decreed."

Lincoln believed in a free democracy where effort and talent gave every man the chance to rise to independence and even affluence. In a speech at New Haven, Connecticut, March 6, 1860, he said: "I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as fast as he can. Some will get wealthy. I

don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else. When one starts poor as most do in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows that there is no fixed condition of labor for his whole life."

Nothing could better illustrate the fundamental difference between Lenine's theory and the vital principle of progress upon which Lincoln here declares himself.

Lincoln was struggling for the lowest stratum of human labor to have its fetters unbound and to have an equal chance with white labor to toil and achieve. Lincoln did more for the cause of free labor than can be done by any socialistic theory or communistic theory of society which enslaves labor in an army of toil and destroys the fundamental principles of orderly human living.

This doctrine of class rule in Russia is the fundamental human difference between Russian Bolshevism and American Democracy. Lincoln expressed it when he said, in a speech to a workingmen's committee on March 21, 1864: "The strongest bond of human sympathy outside the family relation should be one uniting all working people of all nations, tongues and kindreds. Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Here are words that contain much

of inspiration and comfort for workmen; they might even lend themselves, if not taken with the whole context, to radical labor doctrines; but they express that moderate, yet sound doctrine, upon which labor leaders can plant themselves: that labor's future is gone if it pulls the house down upon itself, and does not let others build as their time and talents give them a chance to build.

But Marx in his Communist Manifesto, which Lenine quotes from constantly, advocated "the abolition of property in land," "the abolition of all right of inheritance," and that "the power must belong entirely to the toiling masses."

And the Lenine government has slain or starved or banished the rich, the men of talent, of business initiative and administrative ability, upon the plea that human society is better off without them.

Lincoln knew no class distinctions, for he declared for "a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Lincoln fought compulsory labor; he said in a speech at Baltimore, April 18, 1864: "With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men's labor."

Lenine has decreed compulsory labor for the toilers of Russia, and has organized an "army of toil."

Lenine and Trotzky follow Marx in scorning religion as well as the churches and God. They declare the church to be a mere salve to keep people in bondage and they deny the right to vote or stand for office to "monks and clergy of all denominations" (Art. IV, Chapter 13, Section d, of the Bolshevik constitution). The Russian leaders are following distinguished precedent, for the leaders of the French Terror

abolished God and decreed that "death ends all"; yet human nature revolted and sent its revolutionary leaders to the guillotine.

Lincoln, on the contrary, believed devoutly in an overruling Providence. On September 28, 1862, replying to an address from a delegation, he said: "In the very responsible position in which I happen to be placed, being a humble instrument in the hands of our Heavenly Father, as I am, and as we all are, to work out His great purposes, I have desired that all my works and acts may be according to His will, and, that it might be so, I have sought His aid."

On May 14, 1864, he said to a delegation from the churches: "God bless all the churches, and blessed be God, who, in this our great trial, giveth us the churches."

Lenine and Trotzky rely upon force to establish a communistic brotherhood of working people in Russia. They overthrew Russia's only constitutional body, the Constituent Assembly, just as Napoleon used force to overthrow the chamber of the Five Hundred in France. Lincoln believed in the rule of the majority, the participation of all in a free government, and in a speech on November 10, 1864, speaking in reference to his reelection, he said: "We cannot have free government without elections; and if the rebellion could force us to forego or postpone a national election, it might fairly claim to have already conquered and ruined us."

In his first inaugural Lincoln said: "A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority as a permanent arrangement is wholly inadmissible; so that,

rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left."

Sublime conception and the truth, spoken for that generation, yet applicable to this and to all future generations.

Lenine and Trotzky, leading an arrogant class minority, rejected the constituted and constitutional assembly with the result—"Despotism and anarchy," as Lincoln predicted.

But beneath this usurpation of power by a ruthless and bloody minority in Russia, led by the Marxian leaders, lies a deep moral principle. The doctrine that a minority class may by force seize and rule a nation and by slaughter destroy other classes is an immoral and unchristian doctrine; it is the doctrine that might makes right. It is the same doctrine, in another form, that was proclaimed in the philosophy of a great imperial autocracy in Germany and had to be overthrown.

Lincoln's doctrine was precisely the opposite of this. He said, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Are Americans ready to surrender the Americanism of Lincoln for the Bolshevism of Lenine and Trotzky? Can any American who has taken the oath of allegiance to this free republic, founded on the equal rights of all men, prefer to surrender our government for a class oligarchy, governed by a dictator and a soviet and denying the right of any other class to exist?

Has American freedom lost its virtues and its attractions? Does might make right or does right make might? It is a choice between irreconcilable forces that we have to make, and we may make it with the life and faith and teachings of Lincoln to inspire and to guide us as we make it.

